Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed February 23, 2007.

I. Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action mailed February 23, 2007, the specification was objected to due to informalities. Claims 1-6, 40, 41 and 44 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-6, 40, 41, 47-51 and 57-61 of copending Application No. 09/483,182. Claims 1 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,993, hereinafter Brandt) in view of Weissman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,524, hereinafter Weissman). Claims 2-4, 40 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt in view of Weissman and further in view of Morgan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,799,286, hereinafter Morgan). Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt, Weissman and Morgan, in view of Eder (U.S. Patent No. 5,615,109). Claims 40 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan in view of Brandt, and further in view of Weissman.

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Response amends Claims 1 and 44, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-6, 40-41 and 44. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Amendments to the Specification

In the Office Action mailed February 23, 2007, the Specification was objected to due to informalities. More specifically, the section entitled "CROSS-REFERENCES TO RELATED APPLICATIONS" was required to be updated appropriately. The present Response hereby amends the Specification paragraphs 4-6 so as to remove the attorney docket numbers and to update the status of the cross-referenced applications. No new matter has been added. Applicant

respectfully submits that as amended, the Specification no longer contains the above informalities and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Double Patenting

In the Office Action mailed February 23, 2007, Claims 1-6, 40, 41 and 44 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-6, 40-41, 47-51 and 57-61 of copending Application No. 09/483,182.

The present Response hereby includes an appropriate Terminal Disclaimer to Obviate a Provisional Double Patenting Rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that the Terminal Disclaimer renders moot the rejection of Claims 1-6, 40, 41 and 44 under the doctrine of nonstatutory double patenting, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed February 23, 2007, Claims 1 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,993, hereinafter Brandt) in view of Weissman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,524, hereinafter Weissman). Claims 2-4, 40 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt in view of Weissman and further in view of Morgan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,799,286, hereinafter Morgan). Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt, Weissman and Morgan, in view of Eder (U.S. Patent No. 5,615,109, hereinafter Eder). Claims 40 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan in view of Brandt, and further in view of Weissman.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 now defines:

> *1. A method for analyzing information in at least one source database, said method comprising:*
> *receiving a definition of a reverse star schema meta-model;*
> *generating a data warehouse populated with the information from the source database and in accordance with the reverse star schema meta-model;*
> *receiving a definition of at least one of a plurality of customer profile groups;*

receiving input indicating at least one quantity of interest in the information;
receiving a definition for a data model;
dynamically creating at least one generated database based upon the data warehouse and the data model and configured to the quantity of interest, further comprising:
creating at least one first dimension table based upon the data schema and the quantity of interest; and
creating at least one fact table based upon the data schema, the quantity of interest and the information; and
displaying at least a portion of the dynamically generated database.

As amended, Claim 1 defines receiving a definition of a reverse star schema meta-model and generating a data warehouse populated with the information from a source database in accordance with that reverse star schema meta-model. Further, a definition of a customer profile group is received, as well as input indicating quantity of interest information. A definition of a data model is also received. Subsequently, based upon the data warehouse and the data model, a generated database is dynamically created and configured to the quantity of interest. The creation of the database further comprises creating a dimension table based upon a data schema and the quantity of interest and creating a fact table based upon the data schema, the quantity of interest and the information. A portion of this dynamically generated database is then displayed.

The advantages of the features defined in Claim 1 include the ability to use a reverse star schema meta-model in generating a data warehouse. The reverse star schema meta-model can provide various advantages over a standard star schema model in that embodiments employing a reverse star schema provide a detail level view of data and provide the capability to perform analysis based on concepts such as customer data, activities, and their correlation at the transaction level.

Brandt teaches an integrated proxy interface for web based data management reports. More particularly, Brandt appears to disclose a data management tool that provides a common GUI enabling requesting, customizing and viewing various types of priced call detail data reports (Brandt, Abstract). Furthermore, Brandt discloses a dimensional or "star schema" model, including a central fact table joined to a number of attendant tables known as dimensions (Brandt, col. 20, lines 21-23).

Weissman teaches a method and apparatus for creating and populating a datamart. More particularly, Weissman appears to be concerned with a description of a schema for the datamart,

that defines the relationships between the tables and columns and how data is to be manipulated. Further, semantic meaning that is associated with the columns and rows can help automatically define programs for automatically manipulating data therein (Weissman, Abstract).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Brandt in combination with Morgan and Weissman fail to disclose or render obvious the features defined in Claim 1.

Firstly, the cited references fail to disclose receiving a definition of a reverse star schema meta-model and generating a data warehouse populated with information from a source database according to the reverse star schema meta-model, as defined in Claim 1. In the Office Action, it was proposed that "Brandt discloses receiving a definition for a reverse star schema model" at col. 19, lines 52-67 and col. 20, lines 1-18 (Office Action, page 4). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portions of Brandt merely describe a standard star schema data model comprised of a "central fact table multiply joined to a number of attendant tables known as dimensions." (col. 20, lines 21-24). This is not the same as a reverse star schema meta-model defined in Claim 1. A standard star schema model (as disclosed in Brandt) is useful for providing macroscopic ("big picture") perspective of a business operation, i.e. they are a static solution based upon pre-defined dimensions and summarized data. On the other hand, a reverse star schema meta-model provides a detail level view for data that provides the capability to perform analysis based on concepts such as customer data, customer activities, and their correlation at the transaction or event level. (*See* Specification pp. 18-21 and Figures 6A-6D for description regarding the differences between star schema and reverse star schema meta models). Brandt does not disclose nor mention any reverse star schema meta-model and thus cannot disclose nor render obvious the steps of receiving a definition of a reverse star schema meta-model and generating a data warehouse populated with information from a source database according to the reverse star schema meta-model, as defined in Claim 1. Similarly, Morgan and Weissman also fail to disclose these features of Claim 1.

Secondly, the cited references fail to disclose receiving input indicating a quantity of interest in the information and dynamically creating a generated database based upon the data warehouse and the data model and configured to the quantity of interest information, as defined in Claim 1. None of the references appear to mention any quantity of interest nor generating a database configured to the quantity of interest, as defined in Claim 1. At most, Brandt merely appears to teach an operation data store component that stores billing detail records and

dimension tables using a data model. Brandt does not seem concerned with any input indicating a quantity of interest, nor with generating a database configured to the quantity of interest and based on the data warehouse which was generated as previously discussed.

In the Office Action, Weissman was cited as disclosing the step of displaying at least a portion of the dynamically generated database (Office Action, page 5). However, in view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that even if that were true, Claim 1 would still neither be anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 44

Claim 44, while independently patentable, recites limitations that, similarly to those described above with respect to Claim 1, are not taught, suggested nor otherwise rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 2-6 and 40-41

Claim 2-6 and 40-41 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-6 and 40-41 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 23, 2007

By: /Justas Geringson/
Justas Geringson
Reg. No. 57,033

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Fax: (415) 362-2928